DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 533 SP 008 125

AUTHOR Schwartz, Henrietta
TITLE The Ford Training and Placement Program. Progress Report.
INSTITUTION Chicago Univ., Ill. Graduate School of Education.
PUB DATE Dec 73
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Educational Improvement; Effective Teaching; *Inservice Teacher Education; Preservice Education; *School Cadres; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Ford Training and Placement Program; FTPP

ABSTRACT

The Ford Training and Placement Program (FTPP) is a collaborative effort of the University of Chicago, the Chicago Public Schools, and the communities which the schools serve. The model assumes that (a) each school is a unique system characterized by institutional role sets and personalities with individual needs and (b) universities cannot prepare teachers for any school without the active participation of the professionals in the field and members of the community. The implications of these assumptions are that school staffs should be trained as a group before entering the school and that this training must be a collaborative effort on the part of the university, the public schools, and the community. FTPP worked with 13 cadres in 13 different school communities; developed, evaluated, and corrected five different district summer training programs; trained 314 teachers who were degree students; and provided in-service training on an on-going basis for approximately 2,500 educators in the Chicago Public Schools. The program has produced curriculum materials, audiovisual materials, literature describing the project, research reports and articles in professional journals, and program replications in the United States and abroad. The project will produce a monograph detailing the experiment and has produced a cadre of about 50 staff members who will assist other institutions to train professionals to deal with urban educational problems. (HMD)

ED 092533

The Ford Training and Placement Program

The University of Chicago

PROGRESS REPORT

December, 1973

Henrietta Schwartz

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

I. Introduction

The period from December 1972 through December 1973 represents the last year of the Ford Training and Placement Program Operations. The year was planned as one to be devoted to reviewing and summarizing program operations over the last five years and writing a monograph about the experiment. But, contrary to expectations, the year was very much an operational year. Program staff was engaged in a variety of dissemination and demonstration activities in addition to being involved in the training and guidance of the Dyett Middle School Cadre. It seems appropriate at this point to recall the conceptual model of the program, briefly review the origin and five years of program operations, summarize the outcomes of the operational phase of the program, indicate ongoing activities to which the program is committed in 1974 and speculate about the wider impact of this experiment in preparing teachers and other educators to work in urban schools.

The initial impetus leading to the development of the Ford Training and Placement Program was provided by Dean Roald Campbell, who with a group of interested faculty from the Department and Graduate School of Education of the University of Chicago and public school administrators from the Chicago Public Schools called the Inner-City Specialists Committee, began discussions in 1965 and 1966 about the development of a team approach to preparing educators for inner-city schools. The discussions of this group focused on viewing the schools as part of a larger social system influenced by events in the society and in the

SP008 125

local community. The Committee viewed each school as a unique system. Though schools in large systems were structurally similar, each school had its own informal organization, administrators with personal value systems and special expectations for teachers, parents and students. Further, each school was staffed by teachers with individual need dispositions which influenced their responses to clients. In fact, the behavior of individuals and groups in schools could be analyzed in terms of the Getzels[1] social systems theory. The deliberations of the Inner-City Specialists Committee, the interest evidenced in a collaborative program by members of the Chicago Public Schools and the encouragement of the Ford Foundation led to the preparation of a position paper calling for a training and placement program which attended to the reality of the school as a complex social system. In the fall of 1966, the notions advanced by the various groups were pulled together into an elegant operational design by J. W. Getzels who first presented the model in a speech prepared for the American Educational Research Association in February, 1967. He later prepared an article for The School Review called "Education for the Inner-City: A Practical Proposal by an Impractical Theorist".[2] It is this document which has served as the blueprint for the program.

During 1967 Dean Campbell and other faculty members from the Department and School of Education were engaged in negotiations with the Chicago Public Schools. The formal commitment by the Board of Education to participate in the program was signed on December 27, 1967. The Ford Foundation began its five-year funding of

---

1. J. Getzels, R. Lipham And R. Campbell, Administration As A Social Process, Theory Research and Practice (New York: Harper & Row, 1968.)

2. J. Getzels, "Education for the Inner-City: A Practical Proposal By An Impractical Theorist" The School Review (75: No. 3 Autumn 1967, pp. 283-299).

the project in January 1966. The program was viewed as an experiment to develop and evaluate a model which would effectively address the problems of training teachers for inner-city schools.

The experiment exemplified the shifts in university/school relationships, and the attendant problems and outcomes of the new postures. Initially, members of both organizations had mixed emotions: the university faculty had reservations about their participation in the program; the public school personnel were concerned about having "ivory tower theorists" telling them how to run the schools. Yet commitments were made and operations began.

A. The Conceptual Model Recalled

The Ford Program model[1] was based on two assumptions. First, each school is a unique social system characterized by institutional role sets and filled by personalities with individual needs. The implications of this assumption are to train together the persons who will be filling the roles in a specific school, and to train them as a group before they enter the school. Second, universities cannot prepare teachers for the inner city, or any other school, without the active participation of the professionals in the field and members of the communities to be served by the school. Therefore, any effective training must be a collaborative one involving the trainer (the university), the user (the public schools), and the client (the community).[2]

---

1. J. W. Getzels, "Education for the Inner City: A Practical Proposal by an Impractical Theorist." School Review 75 (3): 283-99; Autumn, 1967.

2. H. Schwartz, "A Social System Approach to Training Teachers for Urban Schools: The Ford Training and Placement Program." Education at Chicago. Chicago: The Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago, Autumn, 1971. pp. 9-15

The basic training mechanism of the program was called a cadre. The cadre for each target school included new teachers, experienced teachers, the principal, community representatives, and others reflective of the social system of the school. University staff members worked with the cadres before the school year began, and intensively during the first year at the school. Thereafter, staff assistance was provided when requested by the group.

The purpose of the cadre was to provide personal and professional support for the new teachers, renew the enthusiasm and skills of the experienced teachers, solve school-wide problems, and bridge the gap between the university, the school, and the community. Increased understandings and better communications should improve the instructional program of the school. The assumptions of the program are logical. Problems arose in operationalizing the concepts, for implementation required changes in the behavior of actors in both organizations at all levels.

B. Implementing A "Practical" Program

At the University, participation in a "practical program" meant a reallocation of faculty resources and time. One cannot engage in theoretical research while conducting workshops for cadres in the public schools or spending hours working with new teachers. In an organization long noted for its inquiry and research, this relative change in emphasis created by the "practical" Ford Program was somewhat upsetting. The collaborative nature of the program required a policy-making committee with equal members of the university faculty and public school personnel.

It was a new experience for academics to share decisions about the staffing, the budgeting, and the content of a university training program with public school administrators. The operation of the program required additional staff members with one foot in academia and the other in the public schools. Established faculty members viewed these action-oriented new types of staff members

with the same skepticism they reserved for "practical" projects.

As the program reached more experienced teachers, many of them began taking classes at the university. Faculty members accustomed to working with young preservice students were challenged by the worldly-wise experienced teachers, often outspoken critics of the graduate programs. Finally, the use of Ford funds to support cadre projects gave some public school personnel the impression that the university had unlimited resources to be used to fill the service needs of the schools. But university resources were limited, and those available to the Ford Program were for specific uses.

For the Chicago Public Schools System, participation in the Ford Program meant a reallocation of school funds to provide support for the public school personnel participating in the six-week summer training programs. During five years of increasingly tight budgets, top level administrators spent hours finding and justifying the required funds to support the program. At the school building level special schedules had to be arranged for the part-time new intern teachers; special positions had to be established at the district level; special payroll procedures had to be arranged by the central office staff.

The program required that new teachers with each cadre be placed as a group in the school where they trained. The schools had to devise ways of placing the interns without displacing other members of the staff and, thereby, incurring union grievances. Furthermore, placing new people as a group represented a change in city-wide placement procedures. The cadres sometimes included interns training as school social workers, adult educators, reading consultants, and social psychological specialists. Positions had to be created by the schools to accommodate these role specialists.

Finally, the whole business of research had to be negotiated. Obviously, any program connected with the University of Chicago was going to have a heavy

research and evaluation component. This was true of the Ford Program, and 50 percent of the staff was engaged in research and evaluation. The Chicago Public Schools and the communities involved in the program demanded some control over the kind of research done. The research process which evolved was not in the traditional educational research mode. Rather research and evaluation activities were negotiated with program participants and cadre school/communities. The transactional mode of research and evaluation evolved by the program is described fully elsewhere.[1]

In summary, the FTPP worked with thirteen cadres in thirteen different school communities, developed and evaluated and corrected five distict summer training programs, trained 314 teachers who were degree students and provided in-service training on an on-going basis for approximately 2500 additional educators in the Chicago Public Schools. Of the 314 degree students, 60% were pre-service teachers. 92% of this group finished their MAT or MST degrees successfully. In the experienced teacher group (40% of the total) 98% finished their degrees. The retention rate of new teachers, interns from the cadres, placed in inner-city schools is 67% over a five year period compared to a 35% retention rate of new teachers nationally and until 1972, a 28% retention rate in the inner city schools in Chicago. Eight of the thirteen cadres are still functioning and the Board of Education through the good offices of Dr. Curtis Melnick, Associate Superintendent of Area A, has allocated three non quota positions to the Dyett Middle School to keep the cadre intact through the 1973-1974 placement year. The program has produced a number of curriculum materials widely used in the Chicago system and in other school systems, audio-visual materials, literature describing the model, research reports and articles in professional journals, program replications here and abroad, presentations at AERA, ASCD, AACTE, NCA, NCSS and other

1. Wayne Doyle, "Transactional Evaluation in the FTPP" in Robert Biopey's Studies in Transactional Evaluation: 1973, McCutchan Publishing Company, Berkley, California

national and regional professional association meetings and presented the program to visiting scholars and educators from 27 foreign countries. The project will produce a monograph detailing the experiment and has produced a cadre of about 50 staff members who will and are using their knowledge to assist other institutions train professionals to deal with urban problems. The project will conclude with a balance "in the black" and with a debt of appreciation to all who contributed to the success of the program.[1]

1. Minutes of the Graduate School of Education, August 8, 1973. Mimeo, University of Chicago - See Appendix

II. Program Operations 1972-1973

The FTPP Progress Report for 1972[1] anticipated the six areas of concern for the Ford Program in 1973. The major task for the program staff was the completion of the monograph by June, 1973. All other activities must be subordinated to the completion of the document by June, 1973" (FTPP Progress Report, 1972, page 15). However, the other six program tasks kept infringing on staff time and energy. The revised date for the completion of the monograph is now April 1, 1974.

First, the performance of program maintenance functions became a problem because the remaining two full-time staff members, the director and the assistant director, in addition to their administrative responsibilities in report and budget preparation, assumed the role functions of the school board liaison and the director of dissemination and demonstration. Further, they continued to meet with placement year liaison staff, convene program committees, provide service for the eight placement year cadres, and teach program related courses. The two half-time staff members in research and evaluation were engaged in the complex computer analysis of the data collected in the last fully operational year, 1972. The two part-time field staff members spent all their time with the Dyett Middle School cadre during the summer training program and at the school during the academic year. We seriously underestimated the amount of staff time required to keep the program functioning to meet the needs of its various clients and we underestimated the amount of staff time required to sift, organize and analyze the five years of materials which formed the data basis for the monograph.

---

1. N. Schwartz, Progress Report, 1972, Ford Training and Placement Program News Briefs, Mimeo, University of Chicago, November, 1972. pp. 1-16.

Second, the Ford Program had acquired a number of commitments and obligations to various publics to explicate particular portions of program history and/or operation. For example, the replication of the program at Rutgers University, "project We", looked to the Ford Program staff for on-going consultation services, for detailed advice on staff development and evaluation activities. During 1973, the Ford Program director in consultation with staff wrote six reports describing aspects of operations in the Ford Program and responding to reports and problems sent to her by the Rutgers' program director. In addition she met with "Project We" staff during the Winter Quarter in Chicago. The same kind of consultation obligations were met in the Ford Program's association with the replication at Northern Illinois University, LaTrobe University in Australia and other institutions considering adoption of the model. It is our impression that the success of the programs at Rutgers, Northern and LaTrobe is in no small measure due to the detailed descriptions provided by the staff of their experiences in virtually all areas of program planning, implementation and evaluation.[1]

Third, the staff was determined to see to it that program documentation was as complete as possible and available to others interested in the program. This required a careful selection of documents from among the working papers in the files, revision of those deemed most useful and submission for cataloging to ERIC and/or publication in various journals. The primary responsibility for this task was assumed by the director and the assistant director. (A list of materials available from ERIC or in print in journals is appended.)

---

1. L.F. Claydon, Renewing Urban Teaching, (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, in press, 1974). The Urban School, (Australia: Pitman Publishing Company, in press, 1974).

Samuel Davis, "A Collaborative Program in Urban Teacher Training", mimeo series of reports (DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University, 1972 and 1973).

Fred Means, "Project We" Evaluation Reports, mimeo. A series of reports during 1972 and 1973, (Syracuse, New York, Rutgers University).

Fourth, the decision to participate in a selected series of dissemination activities was, in retrospect, an ineffective use of organization time and resources. Preparation of papers, speeches and other presentation materials took precious staff time away from the major task - the writing of the monograph. The initial assumption was that the material written for the various presentations e.g., papers for the 1973 American Educational Research Association Meeting, or the 1973 AACTE - ATE Conference, could be used with little revision in the monograph. The assumption proved false. Had we chosen to present a series of selected papers with brief introductions in the monograph, the shorter papers might have been acceptable. Instead we chose to pursue a more comprehensive and wholistic approach to the monograph. The development of the framework for the monograph revealed the necessity for an internal coherence and sequencing of material which was not compatible with the organizing schemes for the shorter papers. Of course, some of the resource material and portions of the shorter papers could be used, but typically with major revisions. So,in fact, we were engaged in two major kinds of research and presentation activities, one geared at the preparation of short papers, journal articles and speeches about particular phases of the program for a series of special interest groups and the other geared to the production of a book defining, describing, analyzing and assessing five years of data and experience with an experimental program. The two full-time staff members and the four part-time staff members who looked forward to a reflective year were not to have it in 1973.

Fifth, the two field staff members, the Dyett cadre liaison and the group process consultant, worked with the Dyett Middle School cadre and their efforts required the support and participation of other staff members. In the last year of the program, we were still experimenting with cadre models for the Dyett cadre was the first to be trained for, and placed in a middle school, the first

cadre to be placed in a year-round school and one of the two cadres to be placed in a new facility planned for team teaching and an individualized instructional program. The cadre was an experienced teacher cadre with four pre-service interns selected from degree programs at the University. At the last Executive Committee meeting on May 21, 1973, the field staff members presented a progress report for the Dyett cadre.

> Mr. Hammond and Mr. Kimmons reported on the Dyett Cadre which is in its internship this year. Mr. Hammond summarized four points from the attached report of the cadre.
>
> 1. The cadre's designing its own training has had a beneficial effect on the cadre.
>
> 2. The variety of teaching methods being used by the cadre is exciting.
>
> 3. The cadre is taking formal responsibility for its own in-service training.
>
> 4. The cadre feels they have a great distance to go, particularly in the area of student achievement.
>
> Mr. Kimmons added that the in-service training program arose totally from cadre members; it was not imposed. Also, their use of themselves as trainers shows the high level of self confidence and reflects the positive potential of the cadre. The content of in-service training has included team teaching, cadre group structure, and developing open classrooms. He emphasized that they are using the methods and techniques of open learning which they expect of their students.[1]
>
> In spite of this impressive list of accomplishments, the cadre is still not pleased with their progress toward providing the learning environment which they envisaged during the summer program a year ago. Although, a few hard measures of cognitive development and no measures of affective development are available, the cadre
>
> . . .feel(s) that the experiences to date have been the planting of seeds which are only now beginning to sprout. The year ahead (1973-1974) is seen by the group as the one in which these beginnings will mature and bear fruit, or else wizen and die. During this important time it would seem crucial to maintain our cadre's instructional strength if

---

1. FTPP Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting, May 21, 1973, mimeo: University of Chicago.

> the experiments now in progress are to culminate in the programs which we hope will become models for middle school education.[2]

The 1972 FTPP Progress Report (pp. 12-13) predicted that the creation of the Dyett cadres to solve the placement problems faced by the program would consume more staff time than was planned when the task of completing the monograph was scheduled.

> The Dyett cadre had to develop group support, maximize resources, resolve interpersonal conflicts, learn to work as a team, improve role competence, understand the social system of the new school and withstand the trauma that goes with the opening of any new facility. Recognizing these needs, the decision was made to operate a three-week summer training program and retain on the staff a liaison and a group process consultant who would provide services to the Dyett cadre during the 1972-1973 school year. The implications of this decision will be clearer as the year advances.[1]

The implications of the decision became quite clear to staff early in 1973. The ethos of the program mandated that cadre's needs be met particularly in their placement year. This new cadre had needs which involved more than just field staff time. Most of the staff members attended more than half of the weekly cadre meetings for the first four months of the cadre's operations. Evaluation of the Dyet cadre involved the research and evaluation staff in cadre meetings and evaluation sessions. The administrative staff was engaged in resolving conflicts between the principal and cadre and the principal and field staff, negotiating nonquota positions for the 1973-74 school year and handling cadre requests for budget allocations. All of these items required precious time, time that was planned for the monograph.

Last, the development and activation of strategies promoting the prolongation of the program was not a major staff activity after February, 1973. Although the administrators in the Chicago Public Schools were interested in continuing the program in the form of the District 13 cadre and other experienced teacher cadres

---

2. B. Hammond, J. English, B. Kimmons, Dyett Cadre Development - A Summary Report", mimeo. University of Chicago, May, 1973. A copy is attached to the report and may be found in the Appendix.

1. FTPP Progress Report, 1972, p. 13

focused on in-service and retraining models, at the University of Chicago, the Graduate School of Education and the Department of Education were in the midst of internal reorganization and selecting a new dean and chairman. The staff, after a series of meetings with program committees, individual faculty members and feedback from the Graduate School of Education, determined that there existed a general feeling that the Ford Training and Placement Program had achieved the objectives of developing and testing a model of training teachers for inner-city schools and that the outcomes of the project should be incorporated into the continuing activities of the programs in the School, as part of the MSTX program for experienced teachers. Further investigation of the model and program operations would be left to the individual interests of faculty members and graduate students. By Spring of 1973 most Ford staff members had made commitments to other positions and activities. The director assumed the responsibility for the completion of the monograph and the establishment of appropriate archives and resource files for those interested in program documents.

Throughout the program's history and especially in 1973, the Chicago Public School personnel and University faculty serving on the Executive Committee, the Co-ordinating Committee and the Curriculum Committee displayed a high level of interest and concern in program activities and facilitated operations. Individually and collectively, they assisted in solving those problems which required inter-institutional and inter-departmental co-operation. Consequently, a number of persons in the Chicago Public Schools and at the University of Chicago are knowledgable about the Ford Program and can answer questions regarding the experiment.[1] The Ford Foundation, aware of the demands on staff time during 1973, has extended the funding period through September, 1974 in order to provide the manuscript and clerical service necessary to complete the monograph. The Department of Education

---

1. A partial list of the placement of staff members is shown in the Appendix.

and Graduate School of Education are donating space and other facilities, which will allow the program director to meet dissemination commitments in 1974 and to organize the archives.

III. Dissemination and Demonstration Activities - 1972, 1973, 1974

After four years of program operations and presentations at a variety of national and regional professional associations, the program developed an audience and a reputation which resulted in a number of invitations to participate in conferences, meetings and discussions of collaborative programs. While the demand for staff services was most flattering, it was also very time consuming. In addition to preparing and distributing our newsletter, FTPP News Briefs, five times during 1973 to over 3,000 individuals on our mailing list, the staff was involved in a number of presentations at home and away from Chicago. In the Fall of 1972, all members of the staff were involved in the in-service training program for the Dyett Middle School Faculty. The program was sponsored jointly by the FTPP, the Board of Education and the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, Project PLAN. In December and January, the Ford Program director was engaged in preparing the final draft of the proposal to establish the District 13 Experienced Teacher Cadre which was submitted to the Chicago Board of Education for submission to the state under Title III funding. Also in January, the director participated in a symposium sponsored by the Chicago Public Schools on the place of fine and performing arts in secondary schools and the development of models for selecting and training staff to work in a new facility with a unique curriculum focus. For the sake of brevity and to indicate the range of activities, a brief description of fifteen of the major activities are described below:

1. February, 1973 - American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and the Association of Teacher Educators Annual Conference - Chicago - Presentation by H. Schwartz and J. McCampbell - "A Bold Step in Urban Education" tape-slide presentation followed by a discussion of the Ford Program as a competency-based teacher education program before competency-based became a catch-phrase. Two presentations - attendence

approximately 100.

2. March, 1973 - American Educational Research Association Meeting-New Orleans - The Ford Staff organized and prepared four separate papers for a special session at the Conference. Mrs. Schwartz chaired the session and Professor J. Getzels served as the respondent delivering a perceptive and elegant critique of the papers and the program. The preparation of the session papers and the organization of the activity was begun in late August of 1972 and represented a major effort on the part of the Ford Staff. The session was called, "The Use of Four Research Methodologies in the Evaluation of an Experimental Program. Each paper used the data from the Forrestville - Martin Luther King, Jr. High School cadre as the example to illustrate the benefits and limitations of each research methodology.

   A summary of each paper is presented.

(See Attachments)

"A"

THE HISTORICAL METHOD OF INQUIRY IN A TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

THEORY AND METATHEORY

by

Don Kimmons

Abstract

This paper tries to show the uses to which a historical method of inquiry can be put in evaluation of an experimental program. In addition to the usual chronological narrative, the paper has used two organizing principles, called a "teleological approach" and a "systems approach," to describe the ongoing sequence of events in an experimental program.

The "teleological approach" used in the paper derives from the notion that the experimental program described had an inherent purpose or end that could be found by the study of an article on how to train school personnel. From this view, the article is called the program's metatheory.

The same article also contains logical constructs for approaching the training of teachers. These constructs are from system's theory and from it was derived the notion of a "systems approach" for historically talking about the program. From this view the article is called the program's theory.

Together these approaches seem to offer the best way of explicating the salient features of an experimental program within a historical context.

"B"

A CASE STUDY OF GROUP LIFE IN THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. HIGH SCHOOL CADRE, 1971-72

by

Kaffie Weaver

Abstract

This is a description and explanation of the failure of the second King Cadre to succeed in implementation of its curricular goal surrounding student achievement. Since the Cadre succeeded with such regularity in other areas of its involvement, why did it not succeed here? Student academic achievement was not only the goal of the King Cadre but also a goal of the Ford Training and Placement Program. Both the cadre and the program had self-instruction as to what was to be accomplished. If it is possible to control consequences, that is, to manipulate them as a system of rewards, then it may also be possible to affect a cadre's behavior in the desired ways. The idea of FTPP treatment being consciously manipulated to shape cadre members' behavior is viewed as fundamental.

THE CLASSICAL PSYCHOMETRIC METHOD OF EVALUATION OF FTPP

by

Michael Waller
University of Chicago

Donald Soltz
University of Chicago

Abstract

Evaluation of the Ford Training and Placement Program relied on both affective, paper-and-pencil measures and classroom observations. Our concern was to discover differences between Ford and non-Ford subjects. An analysis of covariance design, with pre-test scores covaried out, revealed few significant differences in post test scores. A difference in three personality measures seemed to support the validity of the teacher selection process. The lack of other differences between Ford and non-Ford individuals may not reflect shortcomings in the program so much as the inappropriateness of the measures used. We argue that a tighter fit between operation and evaluation would have revealed more.

"D"

A MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO RESEARCH IN EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS

by

James F. McCampbell
University of Chicago

Henrietta Schwartz
University of Chicago

Abstract

This paper is an analysis of the Ford Training and Placement Program from a managerial research point of view written by the director and assistant director of the program to be read in conjunction with papers representing three other research points of view -- the historical, the case study, and the psychometric. It attempts four things. 1) it explains the context which motivated its being written; 2) it explains briefly the conceptual notions which are the basis of the managerial stance that we have taken in the program; 3) it applies the principles of these concepts to the analysis of one of the training groups within the program and 4) it draws some conclusions about the weaknesses and strengths of this approach to formulating and answering significant research questions.

3. March, 1973 - Professor John Raynor and BBC Production Unit from the Open University in Bletcheley, England came to Chicago upon invitation from the Ford Program director who visited the Open University in August, 1972 and described the program. Videotaping sessions were arranged for the production crew in several cadre and non cadre schools. The material will be used for a series of half-hour films on training teachers for urban schools - an Open University course. Ford staff members arranged sites and consulted with the crew.

4. 1973-1974 - Assistant Dean Samuel Davis - Northern Illinois University - DeKalb - Continuous consulation with faculty involved in replication of the program at the undergraduate level at Northern. Visits made on the average of once a month.

5. March, 1973 - Professor Tom Bell, Director of Rural Urban Education Program at Ball State Univesity in Muncie, Indiana. Mr. Bell visited our program, consulted with staff, and met with cadre members at the Dyett Middle School.

6. March and April, 1973 - ALP Research Project directed by H. Thelen, University of Chicago. The Director of the Ford Program assisted Professor Thelen in obtaining school sites for the study on classroom ethos. Cadre schools were visited and several agreed to participate in the program.

7. April, 1973 - National Council of Teachers of English Conference - Chicago. Paper presented by the director on the impact of the English and Performing Arts Curriculum on the attitudes and values of high school students at Martin Luther King, Jr. High School.

8. May, 1973 Department of Curriculum and Instruction - University of Tennessee. Two members of the department, Professors Bellum and Hughes came to Chicago and visited with the Ford staff, attended cadre meetings at school sites and discussed the evaluation model employed by the program.

9. May, 1973 - Department of Teacher Education - California State University - Hayward, California. The director presented the program, discussed the implications for possible collaboration between California State and the school district of Oakland, met with faculty to consider the whole notion of competency or performance based training programs.

10. In-service workships in cadre and noncadre schools during the year involved most members of the staff at one time or another.

11. June, 1973 - Catholic University - Washington, D.C. Presentation to Education faculty concerning the social systems model and problems in operationalizing the model. Emphasis here was on the contractual aspects of the Ford Program, agreements between the low power program, the University, the schools, the interns, the communities, etc.

12. November, 1973 - Department of Secondary Education - University of Illinois, Champagne, Illinois. The director prepared a paper and delivered it to members of the faculty and selected graduate students on the considerations which a university must attend to before committing resources to "practical" collaborative programs in teacher preparation and re-training.

13. February, 1974 - University of Florida - Department of Curriculum and Instruction - Gainesville, Florida. Mrs. Schwartz will present

two papers at the National Conference on Collaboration sponsored jointly by U.S. Office of Education, Teacher Corps Program and the University of Florida. To represent the Chicago Public Schools and its role in the Ford Program, Dr. Curtis Melnick, Associate Superintendent, Area A, will join Mrs. Schwartz on the program.

14. February, 1974 - American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and the Association of Teacher Educators - Chicago. Mrs. Schwartz will present a summary of the impact of the Ford Program on other universities and school systems.

15. April, 1974 - American Educational Research Association - Chicago. Mrs. Schwartz and Mr. McCampbell will present a conceptual analysis of the mode of administration which characterizes low power organizations. Most experimental programs are low power organizations and must adapt administrative strategies to this condition. The title of the paper is "Staff Development in Low Power Transactional Organizations: The Administration of an Experimental Program in Urban Education". It will be discussed by Professor Arthur Blumberg, Syracuse University.

In addition to the activities and the typical dissemination and demonstration events, staff members managed to complete nine of the twelve chapters of the monograph.

IV. Summary of Major Findings of the Experiment

It would be presumptuous to attempt to detail the results of the five year experience with the Ford Program in this short report. Earlier, we reported quantitative information concerning the retention rates of interns in cadres and the degree completion rates of students in Ford related degree programs. In the Progress Report for 1972 there is a summary of the area of major institutional impact. (See pages 14 and 15.) Several of the research papers presented at the AERA meeting in 1973 present information about the impact of the program on cadre schools and individual participants in the program. The fact that the prog: program model is being replicated by other institutions and is a major component of a national conference on collaborative experimental efforts attests to the functionality as well as the conceptual appeal of the model. However, there are certain conditions, implied in the operation of the Ford Program, that need emphasis. I suspect that these conditions are more important than the program or the cadre training mechanism, because they reflect a basic shift in the relationship between universities and the public schools, shifts required to support any collaborative effort.

The program required cooperation at all levels. It required a willingness to share decision making about time-honored university and public school policies. The program could not operate on good will alone, but required a reallocation of resources. For example, costs related to the program had to be shared between the two organizations. Collaboration meant the organizations were willing to put their money where their intentions were. For the public schools, participation in the joint effort meant changes in selection, certification, and placement practices.

For the university, participation meant accommodation of a new kind of staff member. Professors are people who like to make decisions about how they spend

their time and energy. Participation in the Ford Program limited faculty members' scope of decision making and made demands on time and energy which could not be dismissed. Conflicts had to be resolved by negotiation.

Both organizations had to commit themselves to evaluating and reporting the activities of the program and assisting other agencies which wished to replicate the model. The problems related to the Ford Program were handled because people in both organizations recognized that there was enough merit in the training and placement model to justify setting aside established procedures.

The high level of trust and joint effort developed between the University of Chicago and the Chicago Public Schools is unique, but replicable by state institutions and their public school counterparts. If we are to reduce the dissonance between teacher training and practice, universities and public schools must develop innovative, realistic, and mutually rewarding programs and then commit tangible resources to support the efforts.

The monograph represents a selective, longitudinal, summative view of the program's influence in a number of client systems. An outline of the chapter is presented in the appendix.

V. Conclusions and Perspectives

In review, the 1973 academic year was a productive one in terms of the documents, research papers and journal articles which have been added to the program's archives and the general ethnography of the experiment. A partial list of the materials is shown in the Appendix. A new model was developed and documented for the creation and training of a cadre for the year-round middle school. With the exception of three role specialists, all interns were placed in cadre schools and the program funded, supervised and evaluated placement year projects in six of eight cadres and provided services in the form of workshops and consultation for two other placement year cadres. The staff engaged in a heavy schedule of dissemination and demonstration activities, and at this writing managed to complete ten of the twelve chapters of the monograph. Most members of the Ford staff are using the skills and training developed while serving the Ford Program in their new positions and/or research activities. An average of ten inquiries concerning the program or requesting literature is responded to by the Graduate School of Education each week. The program has discharged its responsibility to operationalize a conceptual model, implement the program based on the model, collect information, correct the program and document the successes and failures of the operational elements and report those findings to the wider educational community.

To view the program in the wider social context of the dynamics of education, one must admit that there was a time when universities could train teachers and other role specialists in splendid isolation, ship them off to the public schools, and enjoy the smug gratification that comes with completing a task. During this time the public schools accepted almost without question all of the products of the universities' programs. The society was putting large numbers of children into schools, the schools had vast specialized personnel needs, and the teacher education institutions succeeded in supplying large numbers of persons who were legally certified to staff the schools.

Although critics of the universities' inhouse training programs were around, their comments were not taken very seriously by the faculty members involved in teacher preparation. The critics maintained that university training programs were not producing teachers equipped to deal with a new kind of student, with the human and instructional problems of the inner city, and with the value conflicts encouraged by a rapidly changing society.

As the demand for teachers diminished, these early critics became prophets. The questions they raised about the quality and reality base of the programs were given serious consideration, particularly by the faculties of the large state teacher education agencies. The need to connect the programs to the practice produced a number of important changes in the relationships between the universities and the public schools.

In the past decade, many university faculty members have left their ivory towers and gone into urban communities for a variety of reasons. Following their lead, some private research-oriented universities in urban centers have been experimenting with new field-based models of teacher training. These universities have engaged in the initially painful process of reality testing their theories in the arena of the inner city public schools.

It would be useful to look at the problems and results of the shifts in university/school relationships produced by the experiments. Obviously, private universities will never provide the bulk of teachers for large urban school systems. Yet institutions such as the University of Chicago do perform other services. It seems to me that the sponsorship of the Ford Program over the last five years is an excellent example of the worthwhile service an institution like the University of Chicago can provide in demonstrating a way in which practitioners and theorists can work together to mutual benefit of both -- and the ultimate client, the student in the schools. Such programs deserve the fiscal and moral

support generously made available by the Ford Foundation to the Ford Training and Placement Program.

Who should initiate such collaborative ventures? Certainly not the faint in heart or those unwilling to take risks. It is my feeling that the universities should take the initiative for establishing the cooperative relationships. The example set by the University of Chicago might be summarized with a paraphrase of the old cliché, "Don't call us, we'll call you." The charge should be "If you don't call us, we'll call you again and again and again."

Respectfully submitted,

Henrietta Schwartz